

CONFIDENTIAL

19 October 1974

MEMO FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT SRI Paranormal Research:
15 - 18 October 1974 Trip Report

1. Summary. [REDACTED] spent a total of twenty hours at SRI on 15 - 17 October, during which: a series of general discussions were held, primarily with Puthoff and Tang and to a much lesser extent with Cox and Jones, about past performance and achievements, current status of the research and the details of that to be accomplished in the time remaining; we reviewed in some detail the experimental protocols, went over all the evidence pertaining to several recent experiments and took part in three new ones; and tentative plans were made for an SRI presentation in Washington, probably in early December. In addition, while [REDACTED] was visiting another contractor during the afternoon of 17 October, [REDACTED] spent several hours reviewing SRI's experimental records and sampling the various categories of raw data collected thus far. Despite distractions stemming from reactions to the publication of the Nature article and despite the fact that none of the 'superstars' were able to be in San Francisco on such short notice, the trip was useful in terms of clarifying the exact status of the research and delineating both our expectations and their obligations during the remainder of the effort. While they weren't coy about the criticality to them of lining-up follow-on funds (or support from other sources) as soon as possible, there wasn't any undue focus or pressure on this issue--nor, of course, were any commitments made. Indeed, on balance, they almost certainly view the prospects as being rather more bleak than promising. In a not unrelated vein, there were several attempts to get me to conclude that (from the operator's point of view) the capabilities evidently shown in the recent technical-COE experiments could be usefully exploited in the field. The most I was able to tell them in this respect was that I could visualize legitimate field applications (and a genuinely receptive attitude on the part of DD/C management) only if: those experiments could be replicated with at least the same degree of accuracy under fool-proof protocols (see below); and if there was also some way of providing reasonably reliable confidence-level indicators (EEG or otherwise) with respect to the probable accuracy of each element of the remote-viewing narration.

Current Status & Plans re Basic Research

2. Subjects. They explained the reduction from 9 to 6 subjects by stating that they'd been unrealistically optimistic in our first talks--that there simply wasn't enough time to put nine people thru all the screening tests and then thru the ops testing and that they could never have analyzed all the data (indeed, its doubtful if they'll ever fully analyze the data which they already have--see below). In any case, they felt it better to do 6 thoroughly than 9 partially. As for the 3 so-called 'subjects' and 3 so-called 'controls', their basic error was in not sticking to their guns at the outset--i.e., that when you don't control the phenomena (as in this case) you simply cannot (in their view) determine in advance who the controls are to be. *(Therefore, they prefer the term "LEARNERS" RATHER THAN "CONTROLS".)*

CONFIDENTIAL

3. The Screening Tests. Their reasons for dropping 2 of the tests were as follows: the EEG-Strobe Light was at best generating 10^{-2} figures (in part, they believe, because EEG signals in general are just too noisy to work with) and since they'd set a standard of 10^{-6} for psychic performance they saw no advantage in continuing to devote dwindling time to it; the Laser Monitored Pendulum was also giving low figures with Subjects # 1 and 2 but the major problem was that one has to run a tremendous number of trials in order to get statistically significant results in any PK experiment and the analysis of the data is much more time-consuming than in other experiments. They'd like to have kept a PK test, such as the one with the gradiometer (where, after 150 runs, they were getting 10^{-3} with subj # 1) but, again, it seemed inadvisable time-wise. The remaining screening tests are: Remote Viewing (RV=9 trials), the Teaching Machine (TM=2500 trials) and Line Drawings (plus S/W cards) (LD=10 trials). The current status with respect to each for each subject is as follows (those who've already reached 10^{-6} are indicated by (*)).

Subject	RV	TM	LD
# 1	Completed (*)	Completed	Completed
# 2	$\frac{1}{2}$ done	Completed (*)	0
# 3	$\frac{1}{2}$ done	$\frac{1}{2}$ done	Completed (but to be done again w/ right protocol)
# 4	Completed (*)	Completed	0
# 5	0	0	0
# 6	$\frac{1}{2}$ done	Completed	0

They're getting 'crummy' data from the Line Drawings (i.e., few hits) but will complete them for all subjects anyway. All of the RV and TM basic screening should be completed within the next few weeks. As for their increasing of the Teaching Machine trials from 1000 to 2500, they claim that (in our original conversations & the later ones with [redacted] they hadn't focused on those figures as being necessarily definitive and, in any case, they hadn't really analyzed enough data at that time to make sound judgements about the best number of trials. *It's not iterative. % because of time.*

4. Some Observations re the Screening Tests. All of the RV results will be judged by 5 independent judges, each of whom will get the nine transcripts from each subj and then visit the sites (with replacements) and try to match them. They had been planning to wait til they had all 54 trials completed and may yet do so but I urged them, in any case, to be sure the judging was completed on all which have been run by the time of their presentation in DC and they promised to do so. The LDs are run til they have 10 drawings from each subj--but they are allowed unlimited number of 'passes'. As an example of what they meant by the problem of identifying 'subjects vs 'controls' in advance, they stated that Subj # 4 was chosen as a 'control' specifically because she did so poorly on both the TM and the gradiometer--but then she went wild on the RV experiments, surpassing everyone else in accuracy & repeatability.

5. Status of Medical, Psychological & Mid-Test Neurophysiological Exams. See the clipped pages in the attached Progress Report # 4 for the Medical & Psych matrices--about which the following comments and clarifications should be made: the Halstead-Reitan will be added as an entry in the Psych matrix and, altho all the arrangements have been made, none of the subjs have taken it yet since Puthoff (as a result of some other unpleasantnesses, see below) wants to take it himself first and promised to do so in the near future and then schedule all the subjects; when subj # 2 returned from the Electroretinogram he was almost a basket case--said it was the most harrowing experience he'd ever had--and Puthoff cancelled it for the rest of the subjects; all the rest of the exams have been going quite well with the exception that Subj # 1 refused to take the TAT. P.R.# 4 does not show a matrix for the Neuro Mid-Experiment exams but they intend to do five such exams on a random basis (without any warning) for each of the six subjects. The current status in all three areas is as follows:

Subject	Medical/Sensory	Psych/Beh/H-R	Mid-Exp Neuro
# 1	Completed	Complete(- HR)	0
# 2	Completed	Complete(- HR)	0
# 3	Completed	Complete(- HR)	1/2 done
# 4	Completed	Complete(- HR)	done
# 5	Scheduled	Scheduled	0
# 6	Completed	Complete(- HR)	0

6. Some Observations and SRI Commitments in re the Above Material.

a. The Medical/Sensory Data. We've been receiving the raw data all along (with the subjects' names deleted) and will continue to do so (much of it is reproduced in appendices to P.R.#4). After all the data has been gathered (subj # 5 is scheduled for the next week, I believe), Dr Armbruster of PAMC will collect and integrate the summaries from each department; these summaries will inter alia compare the subjects as a group with the 'normal' population and with each other (seeking correlates); as appropriate, on the basis of these summaries, SRI will go back to Ambruster with questions &/or hypotheses (if possible, at least for spot-testing before the end of the project); all of this material will be given to us as soon as possible and certainly by (or in) the Final Report. I urged them to incorporate all available PAMC findings in their DC presentation in December. If, on the basis of the raw data, we have any questions we'd like to address to PAMC we may, of course, do so through Puthoff.

b. The Psych/Behavioral Data. Puthoff has been having some difficulty getting raw data from the woman in charge of this effort--partially, he believes, because she'd rather deal in summaries; in any case, we will get copies of all the raw data and the summaries--and the same process will be followed as above, i.e.: SRI will go back to them with questions and/or hypotheses, will test the hyp if possible and we'll get the results of such exchanges as well; also, if we wish to pose questions we may do so. I urged Puthoff to put some pressure on the lady, pointing out that because of the relative fuzziness of the data they are sometimes dilatory in making and writing their final interpretations, and he promised to do so this week.

c. Mid-Experiment Neurophysiological Exams. These consist of: 'total' EEG; 'filtered' (alpha) EEG; GSR and plethysmograph. In the Final Report (if not earlier) we will get detailed summaries and interpretations of this material--and we can have access to the raw data any time we wish (but, having seen much of it, I can attest that it would be foolish and probably useless for them to try to send us copies of it). They have only run 7 of them (out of a possible total of 30) and Puthoff admitted that their earlier mention of a possible indicator of accuracy (the suppression of EEG signals 20 seconds before the 'event') was the merest kind of hint--based only on a couple of Subject # 4 readings. I impressed on him the importance of thorough data collection and analysis in this area and, while he clearly agreed, I believe he perceives a real problem with respect to analysis. So far they've only been eye-balling it and even this cursory approach is quite time consuming. I told him we'd been under the impression they had a computer capability for this and he explained that they had had one--but no longer, the background being as follows. They started out by using SRI's Sensory Sciences Lab (and Dr Lukas) for this effort but actually completed only two experiments with him: (1) a Strobe-Light/EEG experiment with subj # 4 in which they successfully replicated last year's results with the man who is now Subj # 1; and (2) a Mid-Experiment EEG/GSR/Pleth with Subj # 1 during an OOB test. But, according to Puthoff, these tests were of a quite low priority for Lukas (who, apparently, is not interested in psychic phenomena) and they had difficulty in getting timely and useful responses from him. So, with [REDACTED] help and urgings, they set up a capability to do the same thing in their own lab a

couple of months ago (I didn't task him with failing to notify us of this change in protocol since using Lukas was their idea originally and not one insisted upon by us--but the loss of another lab's input does, I fear, somewhat degrade the data). They like their own system better than Lukas', partially because it has an analogue output capability, and they intend to pursue the tests in two phases:

(a) Phase I: five mid-experiment tests with each of two subjects, using 'walkie-talkies' for real-time comparison of accurate hits and EEG/GSR/Pleth signals; these experiments are in addition to the nine screening experiments and the later OOB tests for [REDACTED] from this data they will attempt to develop one or more hypotheses.

(2) Phase II: Any useful hypotheses will then be tested on the remaining four subjects.

At first, Puthoff indicated that they might stop with Phase I if no useful hypotheses emerged from it but I insisted that we'd need similar evidence from the other four in any case--and he promised to do at least one and, if possible, five tests on each of them.

7. The Raw Data. As noted in para 1, I spent most of the afternoon of 17 Oct looking at their raw data alone (they merely assembled it for me and, after some explanatory remarks, left it with me). In general, it consisted of: (1) their daily lab notebooks/logs; (2) 45 tape cassettes (and drawings) of OOB experiments; (3) print-out tapes from the Teaching Machine; (4) strip-charts on the EEG/Strobe light experiments; (5) strip-charts on the Laser-Pendulum/Gradiometer experiments; and (6) strip-charts on mid-experimentation EEG/GSR/Pleth tests. In all, while not massive, the assembled raw data is impressive--but much of it, I fear, will not get the kind of scrutiny it may deserve before the end of the project. For instance, one half-hour OOB test with subj # 1 results in possibly 200 feet of strip-charts with five graphs on it--and I doubt if they've done anything with it yet, except eye-ball it and, possibly, physically weigh it. If they don't exploit the data by the end of the project I believe we could and should insist on a no-cost extension for that purpose. If there is anything of significance in that data, with respect to indicators of accurate psychic functioning, it is unrealistic to expect it to be so obvious as to leap off the chart and bite you in the leg.

8. The Hypotheses/Theoretical Aspects of Basic Research. While they have nothing solid to show in this area as yet (which isn't surprising), they say that some useful ideas came out of the Geneva conference--and one of them (see Appendix 1 of P.R. # 4--which, they've already been told, looks suspiciously like 'padding') they have already tested and rejected; that is the Feinberg hypothesis that OOB phenomena are 'merely' short-term 'future memories' of feedback after the experiment. They have run a couple of experiments with subj # 4 in which no feedback was given (or ever will be) and she did just as well. As soon as OTS' consultant [REDACTED] has given us his report on the Geneva conference and his views on possible theories or hypotheses to be tested, it is intended to put him together with Puthoff and Targ, let him see their data and see whether, together, they can come up with useful hypotheses.

Other Matters

9. Series of Technical/Lab OOB Experiments. This series was begun a few weeks ago in response to a request from [REDACTED] who was trying to get a fix on the kind of capabilities which might service requirements such as those which [REDACTED] spoke to us about some months ago. These experiments are in addition to the basic screening tests and the mid-test neurophysiological ones. So far, they've run perhaps ten of them--half with subject # 4 who appears to be the most gifted of all in this domain. I was appalled to realize, however, that--evidently for reasons

of efficiency, to collect maximum data as soon as possible--they dropped a critical part of the earlier protocol and, thereby, have left themselves and the data wide open to challenge. Instead of having someone outside the para-normal lab control the selection of target sites, Targ or Puthoff would make the selection 'randomly' after leaving the subject--usually by listing 6 SRI lab facilities and rolling a die to determine which one they would visit. It never ceases to amaze me how, as scientists, they can be so obtuse in this regard and so personally sensitive whenever I raise the issue. I have assured them time and again (and it is quite literally true) that I'm personally convinced that neither of them are consciously cheating--but that it is irresponsible of them to wantonly discredit such potentially good data as they now have by using, for whatever reason, procedures which will permit anyone else to shoot holes in the evidence. Their (or, at least, Targ's) rebuttal is that if they use Cox or Jones to select the list of sites and roll the die, as I suggested, anyone caring to reject the evidence need only include them in the putative fraud as well. The rationality of this argument is more apparent than real. As I pointed out to them, rational men (hopefully, the majority of those to whom the evidence will be presented) will accept reasonable measures to preclude the possibility of conscious or unconscious cheating--but, in this last series, they have not provided those reasonable measures. Finally, they accepted the argument (for about the fifth time, I might add) and promised that the rest of this series would be done with those additional controls. In any case, [REDACTED] and I listened to some of Subject # 4's tapes, looked at her drawings and visited the sites. All I can say is that, if repeatable with the necessary safeguards, the accuracy is uncanny--and could be of ops value. We brought back copies of two of the tapes and drawings and photos of the sites if anyone cares to review them.

SG11

10. Participation in RV Experiments. [REDACTED] and I took part in two OOB experiments with Subject # 2 who has not been noted for his OOB gifts; both he and they characterized the results as mediocre, even for him. In both instances we controlled the site selection. In one we went (with Puthoff and subject # 6) to tennis courts about 3-4 miles from SRI and he located us as being at a museum about 400 ft from where we actually were; his basic mistake (and apparently a common one) was in 'cognating' the museum & embroidering on that interpretation--while his six drawings were actually much more in tune with the tennis courts. The second experiment, a 'technical' one involving a nearby SRI lab, was quite similar: a number of quite good verbal and drawing descriptions but a quite erroneous conclusion. I had a quite similar experience when I acted as the remote-viewer in an experiment, while Targ and [REDACTED] went to a lab site; the major virtue of this experiment being that both [REDACTED] and I got a much better feel for the actual procedures. I pointed out to them that, in the ops scenarios, we were unlikely ever to have a witting or cooperative subject at the site (and, if we did, we'd not require remote viewing skills); I urged them to try at least some experiments in which the subject didn't know the 'outbound' viewer at all--and then some in which the subject knew him/her only by name/photo/etc and, finally, some in which the subject was permitted to see the viewer in a 'walk-by' situation. They clearly would like to try these variations but I'm not sure they'll get around to it before the project ends.

SG11

SG11

SG11

11. Presentation in DC. This is tentatively scheduled for early in December and is clearly intended to have an impact on those in the hierarchy who will be passing on the question of renewal. In a sense it will be a preview of their Final Report--and I feel this is a perfectly legitimate procedure. As indicated elsewhere throughout this memo, they were urged to ensure that their presentation included several elements--e.g.: as much summary and interpretive material as is available on the medical/sensory, psychological and neurophysiological

SG11

material; independent judging results on the OOB screening tests; 'clean' (i.e., safeguarded) lab RV experiments; succinct statements of where they stand with respect to analysis of the raw data; whatever useful theorizing/hypotheses they (and/or [REDACTED] can present--couched, if they wish, in terms of possible follow-on activity. We should talk to OTS soon about drawing up a definitive guest-list for the presentation.

12. Other Material. A copy of the latest Progress Report is attached--with a few last minute medical raw data sheets inserted. In addition, there are (not attached but available): cassette, photos & drawings of two RV experiments by Subj # 4; and a series of SRI documents relating to the Nature article.

SG11

13. Social. [REDACTED] and I spent 5 or 6 six hours during the evening of 16 Oct with Hal Puthoff [REDACTED]

SGFOIA3

SGFOIA3

14. In Conclusion. I'm impressed by the intensity of their motivation and by the quantity of work they have done--but a bit distressed by the lack of discipline with respect to procedures and exploitation of data. It may be that this is an inevitable (however unpalatable) trade-off for having a pair of such eager, hard-working and imaginative investigators in such an exotic field. There is no doubt that both are very intensely and emotionally wrapped-up in their work, are wholly convinced of the existence of the psychic phenomena they are investigating and equally convinced that they can harness it in time. I cannot honestly judge the degree to which their objectivity suffers as a consequence--or the degree to which any postulated loss of objectivity biases the outcome of their work. For what its worth, I am personally convinced that neither are engaging in conscious cheating--but the very intensity of their involvement does, it seems to me, elevate the possibility of unconscious cueing. Let me hasten to add that I have absolutely no evidence of the latter, either; it is simply a possibility which, given the dynamics of the entire situation, it would be irresponsible not to recognize. On the other hand, at the risk of ~~damaging my own credibility~~, I must admit that the weight of ~~the evidence~~ ^(since I don't believe I've ever seen the evidence) ~~(however faulted portions of it might be)~~ leaves me on balance more persuaded than not of some psychic functioning--although I'm less confident that we now have either the tools to measure it or the capacity to conceptualize or model it. Empirically, nonetheless, I can see operational uses if certain of the alleged gifts can be demonstrated under optimum controls and if measures in support of confidence-level indicators can be devised.

SG11

P.S. A new series of CNB-003 experiments with Subject #4, hopefully including the desired controls, is planned for 4 & 5 November. [REDACTED] is going to be there and has asked me to [REDACTED] to attend.

SG11

SG11

SG11